



700
SEP 09 1999

TRINITY COUNTY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

P.O. Drawer 1613 (530) 623-1217

WEAVERVILLE, CALIFORNIA 96093

Dero B. Forslund, Clerk

Jeannie Nix-Temple, County Administrative Officer

September 7, 1999

Rick Breitenbach
CALFED Bay-Delta Program
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR, June 1999 Draft

Dear Mr Breitenbach:

Trinity County submits the following comments on the draft EIS/EIR's treatment of Trinity River issues.

1. The Cumulative Impacts section of Attachment A (p. A-41) notes that the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) orders the development of in-stream flow recommendations for the Trinity River, but fails to mention that CVPIA (Section 3406(b)(23)) also orders that the flow recommendations be "implemented accordingly". We request that this pertinent information be included.
2. Attachment A explains that (b)(2) water and refuge water supplies are modeled as baseline "existing conditions" because they were explicitly mandated by CVPIA. However, the Trinity River instream flow recommendations are not treated as part of the baseline even though CVPIA explicitly directs that they be "implemented accordingly". If explicit CVPIA direction is the criterion for inclusion in baseline modeling, the recommendations from the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Report should be included as a baseline existing condition. If other or additional criteria are used, they should be identified, and/or the (b)(2) and refuge water supplies should be based on existing conditions, not CVPIA mandates which have not yet been fully implemented.
3. Page A-19 notes that for the modeling assumptions for "Criterion A" in the No Action Alternative, "Trinity River minimum fish flows below Lewiston Dam are in accordance with Reclamation's Draft CVPIA PEIS (maximum flow requirement 750 TAF/year)." The CVPIA PEIS Attachment G6 gives a range of flows from 392,000 af to 752,000 af for the Trinity River Flow Schedule, based on 5 water year types. The weighted average Trinity River flow release under that regime is 542,429 af. Please be aware that the flow schedule included in the CVPIA PEIS was superseded several years ago; the final Trinity River Flow Evaluation Report recommends a range of flows based on 5 water year types with a maximum in-stream release (in extremely wet years) of 815,000 acre feet and a minimum of 368,000 af in critically

dry years. The weighted average is 594,500 af. Thus, the figures used by the Draft /CALFED PEIS/EIR understate the final Flow Evaluation Report recommendations by 52,071 AF/year, using the weighted average of recommended instream releases in various water-year types.

4. Public Law 105-44, signed into law by President Clinton on September 30, 1997, changed the name of Claire Engle Lake to Trinity Lake. Remaining references to Claire Engle Lake should be changed to "Trinity Lake" or "Trinity Lake (formerly Claire Engle Lake)". The reference to "Claire Eagle Lake" on page A-40 may be especially confusing to readers.
5. Page A-18 notes that under Scenario B, existing Trinity River instream flows are 340 TAF "based on a May, 1991 letter agreement between Reclamation and USFWS." The document should note that existing Trinity River Flows of 340 TAF are also based on Section 3406(b)(23) of CVPIA.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

TRINITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



Robert Reiss, Chairman

Attachments: 1. Attachment G6 from CVPIA PEIS
2. Table ES2 from Trinity River Flow Evaluation- Final Report

Attachment G6

MINIMUM INSTREAM FISHERY RELEASES FOR TRINITY RIVER

The following release schedule for Trinity River was developed by the Service for use in the Draft PEIS alternatives on April 26, 1995.

Flow alternative assumes a restored channel configuration, channel morphology (maintenance), riparian inundation and dessication (and seed dispersion), sediment transport, rearing, overwintering, and redd separation.

Water Year Exceedence TPO INFLOW	Wet 0.25 1,800,000	Above Normal 0.50 1,050,000	Below Normal 0.70 850,000	Dry 0.90 600,000	Critical <0.90 <500,000
Week					
01 Oct	275	225	200	200	200
08 Oct	300	250	225	225	225
16 Oct	350	275	250	250	250
23 Oct	400	300	300	300	300
30 Oct	450	325	325	325	325
06 Nov	450	350	350	350	350
13 Nov	500	375	350	350	350
20 Nov	500	400	400	400	400
27 Nov	500	425	499	400	400
04 Dec	500	450	400	400	400
11 Dec	500	475	450	450	400
18 Dec	500	500	450	450	400
25 Dec	500	500	450	450	400
01 Jan	600	500	450	450	450
08 Jan	600	500	450	450	450
15 Jan	600	500	450	450	450
22 Jan	600	500	450	450	450
29 Jan	600	500	450	450	450
05 Feb	600	500	450	450	450
12 Feb	600	500	450	450	450
19 Feb	600	500	450	450	450
26 Feb	600	500	450	450	450
05 Mar	600	600	500	500	500
12 Mar	650	600	500	500	500
19 Mar	700	600	500	500	500
26 Mar	750	600	500	500	500
02 Apr	800	800	700	800	800
09 Apr	850	800	700	800	800
16 Apr	900	800	700	800	800
23 Apr	1,000	800	800	800	800
30 Apr	1,500	1,000	1,000	800	800
07 May	2,000	2,000	1,500	1,000	2,000
14 May	4,000	5,200	2,000	1,500	2,000
21 May	8,500	5,200	4,500	4,500	2,000
28 May	3,750	3,000	2,000	1,750	2,000
04 Jun	3,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	2,000
11 Jun	3,000	1,500	1,200	1,000	750
18 Jun	2,500	1,000	1,000	850	600
25 Jun	2,000	900	750	650	500
02 Jul	1,500	650	550	450	450
09 Jul	1,000	500	400	300	300
16 Jul	700	400	300	275	250
23 Jul	500	350	300	250	250
30 Jul	400	300	250	200	200
06 Aug	350	300	250	200	200
13 Aug	300	300	250	200	200
20 Aug	275	275	225	200	200
27 Aug	250	250	200	175	175
03 Sep	225	225	200	175	175

Water Year	Wet	Above		Below		Dry		Critical	
Exceedence >	0.25	Normal		Normal		0.90		<0.90	
TRD INFLOW	1,600,000	1,050,000		440,000		600,000		<600,000	
Week									
10 Sep	200	200		175		150		150	
17 Sep	200	200		200		150		150	
24 Sep	250	200	209	200	194	175	183	175	183
Total	752,252	573,804		449,757		408,177		393,274	

Table ES2. Recommended annual water volumes for instream release to the Trinity River in thousands of acre-feet (TAF), probability of occurrence, and Trinity Reservoir inflow thresholds.

Water-Year Class	Instream Volume (TAF)	Trinity Reservoir Inflow (TAF)	Probability of Occurrence
Extremely Wet	815.2	>2,000	0.12
Wet	701.0	1,350 to 2,000	0.28
Normal	646.9	1,025 to 1,350	0.20
Dry	452.6	650 to 1,025	0.28
Critically Dry	368.6	<650	0.12
Average (weighted by water-year probability)	594.5		

prevents riparian encroachment along the low-flow channel and provides suitable temperatures for chinook salmon smolts, which outmigrate later in the year than other salmonid species. A 36-day, 1,500-cfs "bench" during Critically Dry water years will discourage seedling germination on alternate bar flanks through inundation and provide some temperature benefits for outmigrating chinook salmon smolts. The rate of change for the descending limbs of the snowmelt hydrographs mimics natural receding snowmelt hydrograph rates.

Because of the long outmigration period for the three salmonid species combined, a variety of outmigrant temperature conditions are necessary throughout the spring/summer hydrographs. Recommended releases for Extremely Wet, Wet, and Normal water years provide optimal salmonid smolt temperatures (Table ES4). Marginal smolt temperatures will be provided throughout much of the outmigration period during Dry and Critically Dry water years. The lower releases during these year classes will allow mainstem water temperatures to warm earlier in the outmigration period, which will cue salmonids to outmigrate (warming temperatures are an important physiological signal to begin smoltification and outmigration) before water temperatures in the lower watershed are likely to become too warm to insure smolt survival. Following smolt temperature control releases, 450 cfs releases will be maintained to provide suitable temperature regimes for holding and spawning adult spring-run and fall-run chinook (Table ES5).

Channel Rehabilitation

Channel-rehabilitation activities are recommended along the mainstem Trinity River from Lewiston Dam to the North Fork Trinity River confluence. The intent of channel rehabilitation is to selectively remove the fossilized riparian berms (berms that have been anchored by extensive woody vegetation root systems and consolidated sand deposits) and recreate alternate bars. Channel rehabilitation is not intended to completely remove all riparian vegetation, but to remove vegetation at strategic locations to promote alluvial processes necessary for the restoration and maintenance of salmonid populations. The tightly bound berm material is hard to mobilize even at high flows, and mechanical berm removal is necessary. After selected berm removal, subsequent high-flow releases and coarse sediment supplementation will maintain these alternate bars and create a new dynamic channel. Specific channel rehabilitation recommendations vary by river segment between Lewiston Dam to the confluence of the North Fork Trinity River because the needs of channel rehabilitation change with tributary inputs of flow and sediment.